

other words, the spoken language is not broken into state vectors and attribute, value pairs. In situations where the natural language may be so simplified, the use of state vectors with attribute, value pairs considerably simplifies speech analysis. In contrast, in open ended situations, which is apparently the situation described in the Haddock reference, no such simplification is apparently possible.

Haddock never suggests using a state vector and certainly there is no attempt to break each state vector into attribute value pairs. In contrast, the entire question is broken into its semantic meaning, namely whether or not it includes nouns, phrases, verbs or sentences. Then, an attempt is made to determine what any pronouns mean by finding the pronouns and then looking to history to resolve their meaning. Again, there is never any attempt to set up state vectors or attribute, value pairs. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-5 is respectfully requested. Similarly, claim 6-12 also distinguish over the art of record.

Claim 13 calls for developing a first representation of a current user query. A second representation of a previous user query is developed and a determination is made whether the first representation includes only one of two types of variables and if so, the first representation is merged with the second representation. This claim is not specifically addressed in paragraph 1. Certainly there is no developing of first and second representations of current and previous user queries and determining whether the first representation includes "only one of two types of variables" and if so, merging the first representation with the second representation.

Therefore, claim 13 and the claims dependent thereon should be in condition for allowance. For the same reasons, claim 18-

22 and 23-30 should be in condition for allowance. In this regard, it is specifically stated in paragraph 4 of the office action that "Haddock do not specifically teach determining whether the utterance representation includes both types of variables". Certainly, if this is so, the anticipation rejection of claim 13 is inappropriate.

In view of these remarks, the application is now in condition for allowance and the Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested.

* * * * *

In view of these remarks, the application is now in condition for allowance and the Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

3/12/02



21906

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Timothy N. Trop", written over a horizontal line.

Timothy N. Trop
Registration No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, Texas 77024
(713) 468-8880 [Phone]
(713) 468-8883 [Fax]